

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the current amendment, claims 1, 7, 17, 19, 20 and 29 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the current amendment, claims 1-43 will be pending in this application, of which claims 1, 17 and 29 are independent. Applicant submits that pending claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and urges the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**I. Claims 17-21 and 25-28 Rejected over Eaton**

Claims 17-21 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343 to Eaton et al (“Eaton”) under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 17 is an independent claim. Claims 18-21 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 17, as amended.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended independent claim 17 is directed towards a method for providing remote access to a plurality of application sessions. Claim 17 recites transmitting authentication information associated with a user operating one of a first computer or a second computer. The claim further recites receiving a

user's selection indicating to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during the operation of the first computer. The claim also recites receiving application output from the first application session in response to transmission of the user's selection to connect to the first application session. Applicant submits that Eaton fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Eaton does not disclose receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during operation of the first computer and receiving application output from the first application session in response to transmission of the user's selection to connect to the first application session. Rather, Eaton is directed towards transferring client data from a first user session of a first messaging client to a second user session of a second messaging client directly without providing the user a choice of whether to connect to a disconnected messaging client. Eaton also does not describe transmitting the output of a disconnected messaging client to the user in response to the user's selection to connect to the disconnected messaging client. Thus, Eaton fails to disclose receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during operation of the first computer and receiving application output from the first application session in response to transmission of the user's selection to connect to the first application session.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Eaton fails to disclose each and every feature of amended independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant submits independent claim 17 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 18-21 and 25-28 depend on and incorporate all of the

patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. Thus, Applicants submit that the claims 18-21 and 25-28 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18-21 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

II. Claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 Rejected as Unpatentable over Eaton and Knouse

Claims 1-16, 22-24 and 29-43 are rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343 to Eaton et al. (“Eaton”) and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0101343A1 to Knouse et al. (“Knouse”) under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 1 and 29 are independent claims. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. Claims 22-24 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. Claims 30-43 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29 as amended. Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that Eaton and Knouse, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claimed invention, as amended.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Amended claims 1 and 29 are directed to a method and a server, respectively, for providing remote access to an application session. These claims recite receiving an authentication information associated with a user having a plurality of sessions that were disconnected from one or more client computers operated by the user. These claims also recite authenticating the user and identifying the plurality of disconnected application sessions already associated with the user in response to the received information. The claims

further recite identifying from a rule source a rule governing a reaction to receiving authentication information from the user. These claims further recite determining via the rule that the user is one of required, permitted or forbidden to connect to a first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions. These claims also recite reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule. Neither Eaton nor Knouse, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention as amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Eaton fails to teach or suggest reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule. The examiner cites Knouse for this purpose. However, as with Eaton, Knouse also fails to teach or suggest reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule. Instead, Knouse discusses applying authorization rules for governing an authenticated user's usage of resources in a session that has already been established prior to the application of an authorization rule. In contrast, the claimed invention relates to authenticating a user and applying rules for reestablishing a disconnected session of the user in response to the determination of a rule. Thus, Knouse and Eaton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest reestablishing the first application session of the identified plurality of disconnected application sessions with a client computer operated by the user in response to the determined rule.

Because Eaton and Knouse, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention, Applicant submits independent claims 1 and 29 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-16 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1 as amended. Claims 30-43 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 29 as amended. Thus, Applicant submits dependent claims 2-16 and 30-43 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1-16 and 29-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

III. Dependent Claims 22-24 Patentably Distinguished Over Eaton and Knouse

Claims 22-24 are rejected as unpatentable over Eaton in further view of Knouse under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 22-24 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 17 as amended. As discussed above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicant submits independent claim 17 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

As with Eaton, Knouse does not teach or suggest receiving a user's selection indicating to connect to a first application session identified from a plurality of disconnected application sessions provided via a menu option to the user during operation of the first computer and receiving application output from the first application session in response to transmission of the user's selection to connect to the first application session. Thus, Knouse does not detract from the patentability of independent claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant submits dependent claims 22-24 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicant contends that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: January 15, 2008

/ Christopher J. McKenna /
Christopher J. McKenna, Esq.
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicant

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
2 International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000